

**REMARKS**

Claims 23-45 were pending in this application.

Claims 23, 24, and 27-45 have been rejected.

Claims 25 and 26 have been objected to.

Claims 23, 28, 38, 40-42, and 45 have been amended as shown above.

Claims 25 and 26 have been cancelled.

Claims 46-48 have been added.

Claims 23, 24, and 27-48 are now pending in this application.

Reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 23, 24, and 27-48 are respectfully requested.

**I. ALLOWABLE CLAIMS**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 25 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to incorporate the elements of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. The Applicants have rewritten Claims 23 and 38 to incorporate the elements previously recited in Claims 25 and 26. Based on these amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 23 and 38 (and their dependent claims) are patentable.

**II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action rejects Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,362,612 to Harris ("*Harris*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,509,726 to Roh

(“*Roh*”). The Office Action rejects Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris* and *Roh* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,013 to Yu (“*Yu*”). The Office Action rejects Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris* and *Roh* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,471,131 to King et al. (“*King*”). The Office Action rejects Claims 28, 29, 33, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,167 to Marty (“*Marty*”). The Office Action rejects Claims 30, 31, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris*, *Marty*, and *Yu*. The Office Action rejects Claims 32 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris*, *Marty*, and *King*. The Office Action rejects Claims 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris* and *Roh* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,362,605 to May (“*May*”). The Office Action rejects Claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris*, *Marty*, and *May*. The Office Action rejects Claims 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris*, *Marty*, *May*, and *King*. The Office Action rejects Claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris* and *King*. The Office Action rejects Claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris*, *King*, and *May*. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding Claims 23, 24, 27, 38, and 39, the Applicants have amended Claims 23 and 38 to incorporate the elements previously recited in Claims 25 and 26, which were identified as being allowable. As a result, Claims 23 and 38 should be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and full allowance of Claims 23, 24, 27, 38, and 39.

Regarding Claims 28-37 and 40-43, Claims 28 and 40 recite that a “start circuit” has “an output coupled to [an] output of [an] adjustment circuit,” where the “adjustment circuit” has an output coupled to a “current source” and inputs coupled to a “circuit branch” and a “further base-emitter diode.”

The Office Action acknowledges that *Harris* fails to disclose these elements of Claims 28 and 40. The Office Action then asserts that *Marty* discloses these elements of Claims 28 and 40 and that it would be obvious to modify *Harris* with *Marty*.

*Marty* recites that a regulator 10 includes an amplifier 5 and a start-up circuit 20. (*Col. 4, Lines 15-20 and 45-47*). The Office Action fails to explain how the start-up circuit 20 represents a “start circuit” having “an output coupled to [an] output of [an] adjustment circuit,” where the “adjustment circuit” has an output coupled to a “current source” and inputs coupled to a “circuit branch” and a “further base-emitter diode.” More specifically, the Office Action does not explain how the amplifier 5 of *Marty* anticipates an “adjustment circuit” that would be used in the circuit of *Harris* or why the start-up circuit 20 of *Marty* would be coupled to an output of the alleged “adjustment circuit” of *Harris*. Without that, the Office Action cannot simply assume that it would be obvious to modify *Harris* by including the start-up circuit 20 of *Marty*.

*Marty* does mention the use of bandgap-type circuits, stating that a reference voltage  $V_{ref}$  may be provided to the regulator. (*Col. 1, Lines 33-39*). The Office Action fails to explain why the statement that a reference voltage could be obtained from a bandgap-type circuit would motivate someone skilled in the art to use the start-up circuit 20 of *Marty* actually in the bandgap voltage reference circuit 100 of *Harris*.

For these reasons, the Office Action does not establish that a person skilled in the art would modify *Harris* with *Marty* to include a “start circuit” coupled to an “adjustment circuit” as recited in Claim 28 (and its dependent claims). The Office Action does not appear to rely on *May* as disclosing analogous elements recited in Claim 40. For these reasons, the Office Action does not establish that a person skilled in the art would modify *Harris* with *Marty* and *May* to reach the claimed invention recited in Claim 40 (and its dependent claims).

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and full allowance of Claims 28-37 and 40-43.

Regarding Claims 44 and 45, Claims 44 and 45 recite a “correction circuit” coupled to an “adjustment circuit” and cooperable therewith for “at least partially offsetting a drop-off in [a] band-gap reference voltage caused by [a] further base-emitter diode.”

The Office Action acknowledges that *Harris* fails to disclose these elements of Claims 44 and 45. The Office Action then asserts that *King* discloses these elements of Claims 44 and 45 and that it would be obvious to modify *Harris* with *King*.

*King* recites voltage reference circuitry 326 that includes a correction circuit 5300. (*Col. 28, Lines 47-55*). The correction circuit 5300 corrects the output voltage of the voltage reference circuitry 326 as the output voltage varies with temperature. (*Col. 29, Line 15-61*). However, *King* lacks any mention that the correction circuit 5300 is used for “at least partially offsetting” a “drop-off” in a reference voltage that is “caused by [a] further base-emitter diode.”

The Office Action simply identifies a voltage reference circuit in *King* that includes a correction circuit and assumes that the correction circuit of *King* performs the same function recited in Claims 44 and 45. This assumption is incorrect. The Office Action does not establish

that the correction circuit 5300 of *King* “at least partially offset[s]” a “drop-off” in a reference voltage that is “caused” by a “further base-emitter diode” as recited in Claims 44 and 45.

For these reasons, the Office Action does not establish that a person skilled in the art would modify *Harris* with *King* to include a “correction circuit” coupled to an “adjustment circuit” as recited in Claim 44. The Office Action does not appear to rely on *May* as disclosing analogous elements recited in Claim 45. For these reasons, the Office Action does not establish that a person skilled in the art would modify *Harris* with *King* and *May* to reach the claimed invention recited in Claim 45.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and full allowance of Claims 44 and 45.

### **III. NEW CLAIMS**

The Applicants have added new Claims 46-48. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. At a minimum, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 46-48 are patentable for the reasons discussed above. The Applicants respectfully request entry and full allowance of Claims 46-48.

### **IV. CONCLUSION**

The Applicants respectfully assert that all pending claims in this application are in condition for allowance and respectfully request full allowance of the claims.

SUMMARY


If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees connected with this communication (including any extension of time fees) or credit any overpayment to the Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: Dec. 30, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William A. Munck  
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889  
Dallas, Texas 75380  
(972) 628-3600 (main number)  
(972) 628-3616 (fax)  
E-mail: *wmunck@davismunck.com*